

the votes to have capital gains. I will give you an amendment that says you can take up to \$1 million in capital gains during your lifetime, but no more than \$1 million. Of course, \$1 million does not mean very much to the people in this country who are going to benefit from the suggestions we are seeing, but I want to see who supports families that have less than \$1 million and who supports families that have more. Because if we are going to construct tax cuts that help families, let us target them, let us help American families who are out there working and struggling and trying to make ends meet.

Again I say, at the risk of being overly repetitive this morning, I hope all of those who spent the last couple of months talking about the dangers of the Federal deficit would stay in harness and be part of the team, keep marching and keep pulling when it comes to dealing with the deficit. We must not be diverted by polls and charts and by the attractiveness of deciding now is the time, with the kind of deficit we have, to propose nearly \$200 billion in tax cuts during the coming 5 years.

I read my children children's books from time to time. They love the Berenstain Bears. The one I read them most often, perhaps, is the "The Berenstain Bears Get the Gimmies," and in that book the parents can simply never seem able to control the habit of the Berenstain cubs saying "Gimmie this, gimmie that, gimmie this." It is the way I feel about the tax cut proposals in the House and Senate by people who talk about the need to deal with the deficit and come to the floor saying: Gimmie this tax cut, gimmie that tax cut because it will gain favor with the American people.

That is not what this is all about, it seems to me. Our responsibility is to do the right thing. And I hope it will be agreed by everyone in this Chamber that the right thing is to aggressively work to cut Federal spending and then to decide to use that savings to cut the Federal budget deficit, and then, when we finish that job, to decide that we will turn our attention to dealing with the tax issues as they affect families—yes, all American families, and, yes, families that work and struggle and spend most of their day trying to make ends meet. That, it seems to me, represents the priorities all of us have an obligation to pursue here in this Chamber.

I yield the floor.

Several Senators addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BURNS). The Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE FAMILIES FIRST BILL AND THE LINE-ITEM VETO

Mr. INHOFE. Mr. President, I have a couple of comments I wanted to make, a couple in response to the distinguished Senator from North Dakota and also one concerning line-item veto.

We heard from the Senator from Indiana many of the good things that would come in terms of accountability with the adoption of a responsible line-item veto for our procedure here in this Chamber. I suggest he may have overlooked one thing.

It is true the President of the United States, whether he is a Republican or a Democrat, whether he is a liberal or a conservative, would be held accountable for those things in which he really believed. If you look at a spending bill that goes to the desk of the President of the United States that has 100 unrelated spending matters in it, there is pork for all the favorites, yet there may be something in there for veterans benefits. So he will stand up and say, "I am against all this pork but I have to sign it because I am for the benefits for veterans. They are well deserved." If we had line-item veto, he can support those things he proclaims to support and reject those that he proclaims to reject.

But the one thing that was not articulated by the Senator from Indiana is it also makes us more accountable, in that once you veto one item and that item is sent back to the Senate and to the House, it forces those Members to get on record so they can no longer answer their mail saying I was really against all those pork projects but I had to do it for the veterans.

So I think the name of the line-item veto is really accountability for the President as well as for the Members of the House and the Members of the Senate.

As far as the families first bill, I would only like to suggest, if one heard the complete presentation on this bill, he would see this could be accomplished and we could balance the budget by the year 2002, have the tax relief for the families, and at the same time have a slight growth in Government—not cut any Government programs.

I think it was well articulated by the Senator from Minnesota that, if we had a 2-percent growth cap, this would accomplish what we are trying to accomplish. But when you look at some of the tax cuts that are going to be suggested in the families first bill, you have to go beyond the economics of it and look at the social aspects. It is a fact today that a family of four making \$25,000, living together happily—if that family, the man and wife, should get a divorce and continue to cohabit out of wedlock, and each become the head of a household, they can increase their take-home pay by 13 percent. That is the issue we are trying to get to.

The unfairness of the earnings test for our senior citizens in America—I have had people come to me in town hall meetings and say, "For the first

time in my life I have been forced to be dishonest because I am not reporting income that I am making, because I do not think it is right for the Government to come along and say I cannot have the Social Security I was entitled to because I want to remain productive after age 65."

So I hope when people are considering the families first bill and the various tax cuts on the American family—all ages of that family—that they consider there are aspects other than economic aspects to be considered.

Since the 1960's we have gotten ourselves into a position where families are no longer important, no longer relevant, no longer significant. This is what the revolution of November 8 was all about. We are going to reverse that.

I yield my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The minority leader.

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, I am going to take some leader time. We are, hopefully, about to come to some agreement on the business of the day, but until that happens I have a statement I wish to make on another matter.

MISSOURI RIVER MASTER MANUAL

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, last week, Senator BAUCUS introduced the Missouri River Water Control Equity Act. I have cosponsored that bill because all the analysis of the current master manual guidelines for managing the dams along the Missouri River that I have seen confirms that change in the corp's management of the river is long overdue.

The assumptions about economic uses that drive the management of the river have not been seriously reexamined or revised in 50 years. In those 50 years, times and conditions have changed dramatically. But the management of the river has not kept pace.

In 1992, the General Accounting Office noted that the master manual for operating the dams is outdated. GAO concluded that the corps has been managing the river based on "assumptions about the amount of water needed for navigation and irrigation made in 1944 that are no longer valid."

According to GAO, "the plan does not reflect the current economic conditions in the Missouri River Basin."

The Corps of Engineers, caught between the competing self-interest of the upstream and downstream States, has recommended only modest revisions in the master manual. In May 1994, the corps selected a "preferred alternative," which calls for shortening the navigation season by 1 month and a higher spring flow rate.

Given the conditions that now exist along the Missouri River, these changes are clearly insufficient to equitably distribute the economic benefits of the river. For example, shortening the navigation season by only 1 month means that the concerns of the

navigation industry—which accounts for less than 1½ percent of the economic benefits of the river—will continue to drive management of the river for the foreseeable future.

A recent review of the master manual revision by the Environmental Protection Agency found that more emphasis should be placed on recreation and less on navigation. EPA concluded that, "The preferred alternative identified in the draft environmental impact statement is likely to result in little, if any, improvement to the Missouri River ecosystem."

Navigation is a declining \$15 million industry. Recreation in the upstream States is a growing industry worth more than \$50 million today. Continuing to give clear precedence to navigation cannot be justified.

And while I am intrigued by the corps' proposal to increase the spring rise to more closely mimic natural flow conditions, I am concerned about possible impacts on bank erosion. The Missouri River has for years been plagued by bank erosion and siltation, which slowly but inexorably takes productive land from the shores and deposits it in the river, smothering fisheries and reducing the hydroelectric generating potential of the dams. It is critical that the corps develops and implements a systematic plan to reduce erosion along the river.

Under current management conditions, the four upstream States, Montana, Wyoming, South Dakota, and North Dakota—States that sacrificed prime river bottom land for the construction of dams—receive 32 percent of the benefits from the river. The four downstream States receive 68 percent of the economic benefits. To illustrate how minor are the corps' proposed changes to the master manual, under the referred alternative, downstream States continue to receive 68 percent of the economic benefits.

Times have changed. Management must change with them. In the business world, management that fails to adjust to changing conditions does not survive. The corps should strive to better reconcile the management of the river with the economic conditions that exist today.

Given the results of the GAO report, the corps' own evaluation, and the EPA review of that analysis, the proposed revisions in the master manual should have gone much farther. Greater consideration should have been given to increasing the permanent pool from its current level of 18 million acre-feet. It is clear that there are significantly greater recreation and wildlife habitat benefits at higher permanent pool levels. Given the immense and growing economic value of recreation in the upstream States, the management priorities for the river need to change.

I intend to do everything possible to encourage the corps to recognize the changes and trends in the use of the river and to develop more defensible management guidelines. The bill introduced last week is a first step. It fo-

cused a beam of light on this process and reveals the long-overdue changes that should be made.

This process will be long and arduous. To succeed in achieving meaningful change, a great deal more education and discussion will be required. I hope that my colleagues will approach this issue with an open mind and allow their judgment to be guided by objective analysis of the conditions today, rather than by memories of what they were 50 years ago.

In the end, management policy for the river should be driven by facts and reason and a desire for equity. I am confident that if those are the criteria employed, more serious and defensible change will certainly result.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

I note the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I ask that I may speak as in morning business for such time as I may consume.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator is recognized.

DRUG TRAFFICKING IN THE UNITED STATES

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, 3 weeks ago, the Senate Judiciary Committee, of which I am a member, held a very interesting hearing on drug trafficking and the increase of drug use in the United States. I would like to say a few words on the subject.

California has now replaced Florida as the major point of importation of cocaine in the United States. The California Bureau of Narcotics Enforcement reports that 80 percent of the clandestine methamphetamine manufacturing labs seized and dismantled in the United States are in California. More illegal drugs are coming into this Nation today than ever before. And Federal efforts at stopping the flow of drugs into this Nation are simply inadequate.

Last week, I met with the head of the Drug Enforcement Administration, Thomas Constantine, who told me that the DEA knows of at least forty 727-sized planes controlled by the Cali drug cartel in Colombia being used to smuggle cocaine into this country—forty 727-sized planes. Most of these planes are offloaded in northern Mexico, and drugs are moved across the California border and other Southwest borders.

Mr. Constantine also indicated to me that the Cali drug cartel's net profit last year was \$7 billion, that the cartel controls the air traffic control system of Colombia, that they control the phone company, which allows them to backtrack and tape all phone calls, and

that they are first-rate practitioners of intimidation and violence.

Consider just some of the following, Mr. President. Cocaine smuggled across the California line accounts for at least 70 percent of the drugs sent over the entire Southwest border by rings based in Mexico, making the State the prime staging area for the shipment of cocaine from cartels in Colombia and other South American countries.

Last year, the amount of cocaine seized coming across the United States-Mexican border plummeted, and not a single pound of cocaine was confiscated from the more than two million trucks that passed through three of the busiest entry points along the Southwest border—Laredo and El Paso in Texas, and Nogales in Arizona.

According to the Los Angeles Times, only 3.7 percent of laden trucks are comprehensively inspected at three San Diego-area ports of entry. The average rate along the entire Southwest border is 11.4 percent. However, last year, laden trucks crossing the border increased 51 percent, and empty trucks increased 38 percent.

Let me say clearly, I believe current Federal efforts to stop the entry of illegal drugs are not working.

THE LINE RELEASE PROGRAM

Let me describe one example of the failure of the Federal Government to stop drug smuggling. It's called the line release program. I believe this program should be discontinued immediately pending an evaluation of its effectiveness. Three weeks ago, I wrote to Secretary Robert Rubin making that recommendation.

The line release program was created in 1986 to expedite commerce entering the United States from Canada. In recent years, the program was expanded to the Mexican border as well.

Under the line release program, so-called low-risk United States companies are permitted to ship goods from Mexican manufacturers without inspection. But the line release program has had a major unintended effect. In the single-minded pursuit of increased commerce, more trucks and commercial vehicles are being waved through border checkpoints without being inspected. The result: The amount of illegal drugs coming across the border is higher than ever before.

According to a Los Angeles Times story from February 13, 1995, since the line release program was implemented, shipments of goods have increased dramatically at four critical points of entry along the United States-Mexico border—Laredo and El Paso in Texas, Nogales in Arizona, and San Diego in California. Yet, even as the number of shipments increased, the rate of inspections and drug seizures decreased dramatically.

I ask unanimous consent that this Los Angeles Times story be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.